Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington D.C. 20554

In the Matter of

Joint Application by	)	
SBC Communications Inc.,	)	
for Provision of In-Region, InterLATA	)	WC Docket No. 03-167
Services in Illinois, Indiana,	)	
Ohio and Wisconsin	)	

DECLARATION OF SHERRY LICHTENBERG

1 My name is Sherry Lichtenberg I have twenty-two years of experience in the telecommunications industry. Prior to joining WorldCom, Inc. (d/b/a MCI), I was Pricing and Proposals Director for AT&T Government Markets, Executive Assistant to the President, and Staff Director for AT&T Government Markets I also held a number of positions in Product and Project Management I have been with MCI for seven years. I am currently employed by MCI as a Senior Manager in the Mass Markets local services team. My duties include designing, managing, and implementing MCI's local telecommunications services to residential customers on a mass market basis nationwide, including Operations Support Systems ("OSS") testing in SBC and elsewhere I have been involved in OSS proceedings throughout the country, including in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Wisconsin.

2 The purpose of my declaration is to update the Commission concerning the continuing problems that MCI has with SBC's OSS in the former Ameritech region, which I described in a Declaration and Reply Declaration in July 2003 responding to SBC's latest section 271 application for Michigan As in Michigan, MCI has faced a number of critical OSS problems in

Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Wisconsin. Although many of these problems have been fixed, some remain and new problems continue to arise The cumulative effect of these problems is to significantly hinder MCI's ability to compete.

3 I will not repeat here my discussion of all of the OSS issues MCI continues to face, since I discussed these at length in my Declaration and Reply Declaration in the Michigan proceeding. I include here only new information that I have learned since I submitted those Declarations, as well as any significant changes of which I am aware during recent weeks. In addition, I respond to *ex parte* letters SBC has submitted in the Michigan proceeding.

Line Splitting

4. In one of those *ex parte* letters, SBC attempts to address two of the problems that MCI has raised with SBC's line splitting process SBC does not attempt to address the numerous other important line splitting issues MCI has raised, all of which stem from SBC's decision to force CLECs engaging in line splitting to create a new "type of customer" with a separate unbundled loop and standalone port rather than simply adding a DSL component to the UNE-P combination. SBC has given no indication of a willingness to reverse this decision; nor has it addressed the individual line splitting issues that arise as a result of this decision. Indeed, even with respect to the issue on which the Department of Justice focused in the Michigan proceedings, SBC's decision to install entirely new loops for line-splitting customers who disconnect their DSL service, SBC has not made any progress. SBC approached MCI with an offer to trial a process that would not require installation of new loops, but insisted that MCI waive certain performance metrics as a condition of doing so. MCI said it would not waive the performance metrics and also said it needed documentation on the alternative process. It has not received the documentation.

5. With respect to the two line-splitting concerns SBC does address, its responses are inadequate MCI has explained that SBC does not permit CLECs to include a DSL line in a hunt group with non-DSL lines. SBC's response (in SBC's July 30, 2003 *ex parte* letter to the FCC in WC Docket 03-138) reveals how difficult it is to obtain straight answers from SBC. MCI has been attempting to obtain information about hunting from SBC from the start of our work on DSL and line splitting and for months was not told of any limitations. It took significant probing for MCI finally to learn of the limitations that MCI has discussed. But SBC begins its July 30 *ex parte* letter by saying that MCI's argument regarding hunting is "not true." Yet SBC goes on to acknowledge that hunting can be provided only when all of the customer's lines are the same "type " But in SBC's view a line-split line is not the same type as a UNE-P line (because it is a UNE-ST (standalone UNE port) customer with unbundled transport) and thus cannot be included in a hunt group of UNE-P lines. SBC goes on to explain a very complex work-around that would require MCI to make changes to the customer's current configuration when the customer chooses to order line splitting It suggests that MCI can change all of the lines in the hunt group from UNE-P to UNE-ST (the standalone UNE port) with unbundled transport. That is, MCI can send orders asking SBC to take apart the UNE-P combinations and re-install them and then submit a line splitting order. But this would involve significant unnecessary work on MCI's part, would risk loss of dial tone on each line, and would require MCI to pay SBC for the changes. This is unworkable

6 In its July 30 *ex parte* letter, SBC also suggests that MCI use Busy Line Transfer to emulate hunting. This also would require MCI to place separate LSRs to remove hunting from existing lines, then to install busy line transfer, and then to install line splitting. Moreover, there are disadvantages of using Busy Line Transfer, including the customer's inability to remove one

line from the transfer group if, for example, a person with a particular line is away from the office for an extended period of time In addition, there may be a slight delay in the call being transferred in this way compared to hunting. And there may be costs of having the calls repeatedly bounced out to the switch MCI has asked SBC to detail the differences between hunting and call forwarding but has not yet received a response.

7 SBC goes on to suggest that it would be possible to establish hunting through the bona fide request process, but this is not acceptable either. A CLEC should not have to pay for a special development through the BFR process when it simply wants what other LECs provide Since hunting is a switch port function and the port is not changing (according to SBC), it is not clear why special development is necessary to allow hunting. Even if development is needed, such development could already have been accomplished if SBC had revealed the problem when MCI first asked SBC questions about hunting MCI could then have submitted a change request to fix the problem It is entirely unclear why SBC has suggested a BFR is needed.

8 SBC also responds in its July 30 *ex parte* letter to MCI's discussion of the discriminatory nature of SBC's process of migrating line splitting customers back to SBC. SBC permits such migration without the need for either the customer or SBC to submit an order to the CLEC to disconnect the DSL In fact, SBC continues to bill the CLEC for the DSL line after the migration until the CLEC determines it is necessary to submit a disconnect order for the DSL. In contrast, when an SBC retail customer with DSL migrates to a CLEC, either the CLEC or the customer must first place an order to disconnect the DSL. Otherwise, the order will reject. Thus, under SBC's process, it is easier to migrate back to SBC then away from SBC, and the CLEC continues to be billed after the migration

9. SBC says in its July 30 *ex parte* letter that MCI was wrong that the customer needs to request his DSL be disconnected before he can migrate away from SBC And it is true that MCI, rather than the customer, could submit the disconnect order. The key point is unchanged, however; it is necessary to submit a disconnect order for DSL before the customer can move away from SBC, but not before the customer can return to SBC This is blatantly discriminatory

10 In addition, as I have explained, SBC continues to bill the CLEC for the DSL loop even after the customer has returned to SBC. SBC says that the CLEC can submit a disconnect order at that point and will know to do this based on information in the line loss record SBC July 30 *ex parte* letter MCI is checking to see whether the line loss record actually shows the information on the circuit ID, etc However, the central point remains correct: After SBC processes a winback, a CLEC must send an order to disconnect the DSL, and will be billed in the interim Moreover, even if SBC sends information that enables the CLEC to determine whether it needs to send a disconnect order, it will need to develop new software to read this information off of the line loss reports and will still pay for the in-place DSL circuit until the line loss is received and the disconnect order is created, sent, processed by SBC, and the SBC billing systems are updated. This could be several days or even longer. Remarkably, the need to develop software to read such line loss information was not announced to CLECs; nor was the whole issue of having to submit disconnect orders after line-splitting customers returned to SBC in a winback situation.

11. In addition, SBC has also just stated that there is a software flaw that is allowing CLEC to CLEC migrations where the losing CLEC customer has DSL rather than rejecting the orders, as it should. SBC will be updating its systems to reject these orders, but not to reject winbacks,

which is of course anticompetitive. And, again, SBC has not announced this problem to all CLECs

Change Management

12 MCI also has updated information on change management. In particular, defects continue to pile up with respect to past releases demonstrating the poor quality of these releases. As of August 5, 2003, there remain 44 defects open for release 6.0, 63 defects open for release 5.3, and 36 defects open for release 5.2, each of which affects SBC's Midwest region.

Billing

13. MCI has undertaken a detailed analysis of the lines-in-service "snapshot" report provided by SBC, and compared it with MCI's local database. After taking into account line losses and other changes, the results of the comparison show that there are 5,612 lines which are included in the lines-in-service report, but which are not included in MCI's local database or are listed as deactive On August 5 and 6, 2003. MCI requested SBC to verify that these lines are actually MCI's local customers

14 MCI's analysis suggests that there are various problems with SBC's databases relating to these 5,612 lines Even though each of these lines is included in SBC's lines-in-service report, SBC (i) does not bill MCI for telco for the line but reports traffic usage (430 lines in issue), or (ii) does not report any traffic usage for the line but bills for telco (3,552 lines in issue); or (iii) neither bills telco or reports traffic usage (1630 lines in issue). This demonstrates that SBC's internal databases contain errors that need to be rectified, and may indicate that these are not MCI's local customers.

15. This is most troubling with respect to the 3,552 lines for which SBC bills telco to MCI, but does not report any usage. While a few customers may not make any use of their telephone

lines for lengthy periods of time, it is unlikely that this is true for significant numbers of customers Since MCI does not show these lines as active in its database, it is not billing them to any customer even though it is receiving telco charges from SBC.

16. One additional anomaly in the lines-in-service report is that many of the lines on which SBC reports traffic usage are being billed to MCI as resale traffic, rather than as UNE-P traffic as would be proper MCI has converted all its active resale customers to UNE-P and no longer has any active resale customers in the region

17 SBC is again having problems both with erroneous line loss notifications being sent and with its processes for alerting CLECs to its line loss errors. On June 3, 2003, SBC sent MCI 414 line loss notifications in error, which SBC ultimately blamed on service rep errors and now states have been remedied by an "awareness session" and by coaching the particular service rep who made the error See August 1, 2003 e-mail from SBC to MCI (attached to Comments at Tab 5). However, SBC did not inform MCI that these line loss notifications were erroneous until July 31, when it stated that 16 of these line losses were for MCI customers who actually had not left MCI. Naturally, MCI stopped billing these customers and stopped providing customer service and support for the two months between receiving SBC's erroneous line loss notifications and learning that the line losses had been sent in error. The other 398 line loss notifications were for lines that did not belong to MCI according to SBC. MCI is attempting to learn why it took so long for SBC to correct its errors.

18 In addition, a defect discovered in late July 2003 in SBC's March 15 release appears to have caused at least 1400 billing errors relating to CLEC to CLEC migrations. Apparently, if the winning CLEC is at Version 5 02 and the losing CLEC is at a higher version, SBC erroneously called the losing CLEC the winning CLEC and updated ACIS (and CABS and CLEC bills)

incorrectly While this problem caused erroneous line losses as well as incorrect billing, SBC has chosen not to announce it as such, perhaps to evade further proof that the line loss process is still broken, despite numerous claims otherwise This is another example of how the errors in ACIS may be at the root of many of SBC's billing problems.

19 MCI asked SBC on August 6 about another 36 lines on which it received line loss notifications from SBC, but which were still included in SBC's lines-in-service report. SBC is charging telco and reporting usage on each of these lines, so it appears that the line loss notifications sent in March and April, prior to the April 30 lines-in-service report, were in error. MCI has asked for an explanation.

Conclusion

20. This concludes my Declaration on behalf of MCI.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct

Executed on August 6, 2003